

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

AIMEE MORRISON,

Plaintiff

v.

JOE BRONCATO and OSWEGO COUNTY,

Defendants

Case No.: 2:21-cv-00667-APG-EJY

Order Granting Motion to Stay Case

[ECF No. 24]

Defendants Joe Broncato and Oswego County move for a stay of the case because plaintiff Aimee Morrison files numerous “notices of motion” that are rogue filings to which the defendants should not have to respond. Morrison did not respond.

A district court has the inherent power to stay cases to control its docket and promote the efficient use of judicial resources. *Landis v. N. Am. Co.*, 299 U.S. 248, 254–55 (1936); *Dependable Highway Exp., Inc. v. Navigators Ins. Co.*, 498 F.3d 1059, 1066 (9th Cir. 2007). When determining whether to stay a case pending the resolution of another case, I must consider (1) the possible damage that may result from a stay, (2) any “hardship or inequity” that a party may suffer if required to go forward, (3) “and the orderly course of justice measured in terms of the simplifying or complicating of issues, proof, and questions of law” that a stay will engender. *Lockyer v. Mirant Corp.*, 398 F.3d 1098, 1110 (9th Cir. 2005). I find that a *Landis* stay is appropriate here.

Morrison did not respond to the motion, so she has not identified a harm that would result from the stay. The defendants will suffer a hardship if they must respond to the many notices that Morrison files that are rambling and appear to have no purpose other than cluttering up the docket. Magistrate Judge Youchah recently advised Morrison that her “repeated Notice of

1 Motion filings are inappropriate and unnecessary,” and she advised Morrison to “cease filing
2 these documents absent an order from the Court to do so.” ECF No. 47. Despite Judge
3 Youchah’s order, Morrison filed two more notices, including one in which she asserts she is an
4 endangered species. ECF Nos. 48, 49. Finally, relieving the defendants of the burden of having
5 to respond to Morrison’s notices serves the orderly course of justice.

6 I therefore grant the defendants’ motion to stay the case until I resolve the pending case
7 dispositive motions. Morrison is again directed not to file “notices” in this case. If she
8 nevertheless does so, the defendants need not respond. Morrison is advised that repeated failures
9 to follow court orders may result in sanctions, including dismissal of this action with prejudice.

10 I THEREFORE ORDER that the defendants’ motion to stay the case (**ECF No. 24**) is
11 **GRANTED**. This case is STAYED pending further order of the court.

12 DATED this 3rd day of August, 2021.



ANDREW P. GORDON
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE